

***RESULTS OF THE FRFA FOR AMENDMENT 13 TO THE NEW ENGLAND
MULTISPECIES FISHERY***

April 2004

Measures	Overall Vessel Impacts	By Port of Landing	By Vessel Size	By Gear Type	By Dependence on Multispecies	Near Term Impact to the Economy	Long Term Impacts to the Economy
Recreational Measures							
Proposed Recreational Measures	The proposed measures remove the haddock bag limit; relax the cod bag limit to 10 cod fish per person per day from 10 codfish per person per trip; and replace the 5 codfish seasonal limit in GOM. The modified bag limit for cod and removal of the haddock bag limit is expected to improve Charter/Party business profits w/ an increased demand for bookings. A slight increase in the cod minimum size and a slight decrease in the haddock minimum size will have little impact on demand for recreational trips.	Gloucester, Portsmouth, Southern Maine, and South Shore of Mass would be most impacted.	N/A	Recreational handgear.	N/A	Increase in consumer and producer surplus; positive net benefits derived from fishing gear, restaurants, marinas, etc.	Increase in consumer and producer surplus; positive net benefits derived from fishing gear, restaurants, marinas, etc.
Significant Alternatives to Proposed Recreational Measures	<p>There are no significant alternatives that would have more beneficial impacts than the proposed.</p> <p>The status quo alternative (settlement agreement) would retain a trip bag limit comprised of a total of 10 cod / haddock per trip for charter/party anglers fishing in the GOM.</p> <p>The third alternative would increase the minimum size of cod, reduce the minimum size of haddock, prohibit fishing in the GOM from December through March, and implement a 10 cod/trip limit</p>	See above.	N/A	N/A	N/A		

Measures	Overall Vessel Impacts	By Port of Landing	By Vessel Size	By Gear Type	By Dependence on Multispecies	Near Term Impact to the Economy	Long Term Impacts to the Economy
Stock Rebuilding Measures							
Proposed Commercial Measures	<p>Proposed commercial measures include a change in baseline DAS, and a number of management measures that effect the manner that DAS allocations are used.</p> <p>Estimated total economic impact is a reduction in revenues of \$40 M in the first year of implementation. This does not reflect B Days at sea usage which could reduce impacts.</p>	Gloucester, Portland, and Boston most impacted	<p>Small long line vessels could be impacted with a 25 to 35 percent projected business failure rate.</p> <p>Small gillnet vessels business failures could range from 19 to 24 percent.</p> <p>Small trawl vessels failure rates range from 27 to 33 percent.</p>	For longline and gillnet vessels, medium and large vessels in each gear type have less chance of business failure vs small vessels. Large trawl vessels have a higher projected business failure rate (31 to 43 percent) than small and medium trawl vessels.	<p>Vessels with the highest dependence on groundfish are the most affected. Relative changes not markedly different among 55 vessels most dependent on groundfish.</p>	<p>Loss in consumer and producer surplus; negative net benefits to wharves, stevedoring, food and fuel supplier, etc.</p> <p>Revenue lost to NE ports of \$135 million in first year</p> <p>1,900 affected jobs in first year</p>	<p>Increase in consumer and producer surplus; positive net benefits to wharves, stevedoring, food and fuel suppliers, etc.</p> <p>Net Present Value of \$2,624 million through 2014.</p>

Measures	Overall Vessel Impacts	By Port of Landing	By Vessel Size	By Gear Type	By Dependence on Multispecies	Near Term Impact to the Economy	Long Term Impacts to the Economy
Significant Alternatives to Proposed Commercial Measures ¹	In addition to the No-Action alternative which leaves the fishery unchanged, the Phased reduction alternatives 1B and 1D would have a lesser negative impact on multispecies vessels than the proposed alternative in the first year of the rebuilding period; \$28.3M and \$33M, respectively, compared to \$40M for the proposed alternative. All other rebuilding alternatives would have a higher first year impact.	Maine and Massachusetts are most impacted. Specifically the ports of Portland, Gloucester, Boston, and New Bedford.	Small vessels using gillnet or hook gear would benefit due to an unchanged GOM cod limit as opposed to a reduction in GB cod limit.	This would benefit vessels that are not dependent on Georges Bank (GB) cod. Hookgear would benefit the most followed by gillnet and trawl gear.	Same as above, but benefits vessels that are not as dependent on Georges Bank cod because of the trip limit. Revenue losses for Alternative 1B and 1D are lower across all vessels dependent on groundfish.	Loss in consumer and producer surplus; negative net benefits to wharves, stevedoring, food and fuel suppliers, etc Revenue lost to NE ports of \$95 million in first year 1,300 affected jobs in first year	Increase in consumer and producer surplus; positive net benefits to wharves, stevedoring, food and fuel suppliers, etc. Net Present Value of \$2,671million through 2014.

¹ Alternatives 1B and 1D consist of a series of increasing DAS reductions of 35 percent in 2004, 45 percent in 2005, 55 percent in 2006, and 65 percent in 2007. The full schedule of reductions was not evaluated for the simple reason that the area closure model used to evaluate all other alternatives is not a dynamic model. Therefore, profitability losses and gains could not be compounded but only considered on a year-to year basis. Applying the area closure model to the full 65 percent reduction in DAS would have misrepresented the year-4 impacts so it was not done. Alternative 1B also contains the 2:1 DAS counting in SNE and the raised footrope trawl in the CC/GOM stock area. Presumably, at least part of the negative economic impact of the 2005 DAS reduction would be offset by a change in productivity; similarly for the DAS reduction in 2006 and 2007. It is important to note that in order for Alternative 1B to have no additional cumulative negative economic impacts after the first year, it must be the case that the relative change in productivity must be proportional to the change in DAS. In other words, an annual productivity increase of 10 percent would be required to offset the 10 percent reduction in DAS. This is highly unlikely. NMFS has concluded that it is more likely that the cumulative impacts of four years of DAS reductions would exceed that of the preferred alternative especially since the difference between the two alternatives in 2004 is only about \$12 million in gross sales. This gap begins to narrow rather quickly when one considers that while revenues would likely increase in 2005 under the preferred alternative, they would be declining under Alternative 1B as DAS continue to be reduced. In addition, the FSEIS notes that the negative impacts attributable to the preferred alternative were overestimated because of the inability to formally include the positive effects of harvest under B DAS. Alternative 1B contains no such opportunities. Therefore, NMFS concludes that the gap between these two alternatives narrows in 2004 with the addition of the harvest using B DAS and very much favors the preferred alternative in 2005 through 2007. While Alternative 1B was considered, it was apparent that the risk of not achieving required productivity gains after year 1 was very high and could do irreparable economic harm to the NE multispecies fleet in the final 3 years of the stepped reduction.

Measures	Overall Vessel Impacts	By Port of Landing	By Vessel Size	By Gear Type	By Dependence on Multispecies	Near Term Impact to the Economy	Long Term Impacts to the Economy
Habitat Closed Areas							
The proposed action would implement habitat closed areas that are modifications of existing closed areas (Alternatives 2,7, and 10B)	The proposed Level 3 habitat closure would allow stationary bottom tending gear and mid-water trawl gear to continue to fish in a habitat closed area. As a result, total revenues earned by vessels using these gears would not be reduced. The revenue losses from prohibiting bottom tending mobile gear in a Level 3 closure ranged from 8.1 percent (Alternative 5b) to 0.5 percent (Alternatives 6, 10A and 10B). However, revenue losses for some specific species groups were substantially reduced. Revenue losses for groundfish would be partially offset by a Level 3 closure since gillnet and hook segments of the groundfish fishery would not be affected. However, bottom trawl gear accounts for the majority of groundfish effort, hence, groundfish revenue losses would still range between 9 and 14 percent for all gear for all alternatives except Alternatives 6, 10A, and 10B. Since a Level 3 habitat closure does not provide any relief to fisheries using mobile bottom-tending gear, the share of revenue impact for fisheries that are dominated by these mobile gears increases relative to other fishery impacts. In addition to Alternatives 7 and 10b, the Council has also adopted Alternative 2 to address impacts of fishing on EFH. There are no anticipated economic impacts resulting from the selection of Alternative 2. This Alternative relies on the habitat benefits of other non-habitat related management measures implemented through Amendment 13 to meet the EFH provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Act. The No-Action alternative would sustain current levels of profitability, whereas, those vessels prohibited in habitat closed areas would have a reduction in their profitability resulting from the proposed action. when compared to the proposed action. Affected gear types include clam dredges and bottom trawl gear.	Maine and Massachusetts are most impacted. Specifically the ports of Portland, Gloucester, Boston, and New Bedford.	N/A	Only stationary bottom tending gear and mid-water trawl gear would not be effected be a level 3 closure. Since a large proportion of monkfish are landed with gillnet gear, the Level 3 closure would mitigate a substantial proportion of estimated monkfish revenue losses associated with a level 1 closure. Similarly, revenue losses for the “other” species group would be mitigated under a Level 3 closure because a significant proportion of these revenues are comprised of lobster landings from trap gear. The surf clam/ocean quahog fishery would be impacted by a 0.9 percent revenue loss. The surf clam/ocean quahog fishery would further be impacted since under proposed Alternative 7 since surf clam/ocean quahog dredges would not continue to be exempted from regulations prohibiting the use of that gear in multispecies closed areas. Therefore, while short-term revenue losses are estimated to be 0.9 percent there may be longer term impacts which cannot be estimated until further closures are undertaken.	N/A	Loss in consumer and producer surplus; negative net benefits to wharves, stevedoring, food and fuel suppliers, etc.	Indeterminate

Measures	Overall Vessel Impacts	By Port of Landing	By Vessel Size	By Gear Type	By Dependence on Multispecies	Near Term Impact to the Economy	Long Term Impacts to the Economy
Significant alternatives to the proposed.	The are no significant alternative to the proposed action other than the No-Action alternative. The habitat closed area alternatives are, for the most part, variants of the proposed areas. The revenue losses for the remaining alternatives were 1 to 2 percent lower than the proposed. A level 1 closure would affect additional gear types and fisheries including mid-water trawl and bottom tending gear fisheries.	Maine and Massachusetts are most impacted. Specifically the ports of Portland, Gloucester, Boston, and New Bedford.	N/A	All gear, including mid-water trawl and bottom tending mobile gear, would be impacted under a level 1 closure.			
Mitigating measures							
B DAS	Category B DAS would be subdivided into two categories, one which would be used in Special Access Programs (reserve B DAS), while the use of the remaining B days or Regular B DAS will be determined in a Framework Action. The primary purpose of B DAS is to provide access to and increased yield from stocks that may be fished at higher levels under the Special Access Programs (SAPs). These opportunities would enhance profitability for vessels that may be able to participate in any one or more of these special fisheries.	Multiple ports.	N/A	All gears affected.	N/A	Increase in consumer and producer surplus; positive net benefits to wharves, stevedoring, food and fuel suppliers, etc.	Increase in consumer and producer surplus; positive net benefits to wharves, stevedoring, food and fuel suppliers, etc.
SAPs	One SAP would utilize B DAS. SAPs are designed to allow the harvest of healthy fish stocks while avoiding stocks that are rebuilding. CA II Yellowtail Flounder SAP would be available to vessels when fishing under their category B DAS. The remaining SAP, the SNE/MA Winter Flounder SAP, would allow access to a limited amount of winter flounder outside of the DAS program.	Multiple ports.	N/A	All gears affected.	N/A	Increase in consumer and producer surplus; positive net benefits to wharves, stevedoring, food and fuel suppliers, etc.	Increase in consumer and producer surplus; positive net benefits to wharves, stevedoring, food and fuel suppliers, etc.

Measures	Overall Vessel Impacts	By Port of Landing	By Vessel Size	By Gear Type	By Dependence on Multispecies	Near Term Impact to the Economy	Long Term Impacts to the Economy
DAS Transfers and Leasing	Particularly for vessels with few alternative fisheries, reductions in profit may be offset by the ability to acquire more DAS either through leasing or DAS transfer. The former would make DAS available to a vessel for a single fishing season whereas the latter would be a permanent transfer of DAS from one vessel to another. Transferred DAS would be subject to a 40-percent conservation tax on the transfer, but vessels would be able to acquire both Category A and Category B DAS. By contrast, a DAS lease would not be subject to a conservation tax but vessels would be only allowed to acquire Category A DAS. It is not known which option any given vessels may choose to pursue, but analysis clearly suggests that making DAS available in some form of exchange can improve overall profitability for both buyer and seller.	Gloucester, Portland, and Boston most impacted.				Increase in consumer and producer surplus; positive net benefits to wharves, stevedoring, food and fuel suppliers, etc.	Increase in consumer and producer surplus; positive net benefits to wharves, stevedoring, food and fuel suppliers, etc.

Measures	Overall Vessel Impacts	By Port of Landing	By Vessel Size	By Gear Type	By Dependence on Multispecies	Near Term Impact to the Economy	Long Term Impacts to the Economy
Handgear A Permits	<p>The proposed action would convert the existing open access hand-gear permit into a limited access category and an open access category Hand gear A permits. Vessels that qualify for a limited access permit would benefit from a relaxation of the cod trip limit and would not be subject to trip limits on any other species. Vessels that do not qualify for limited access would still be able to obtain an open access permit but the cod trip limit would be much lower than current hand-gear only permit holders may retain. Available data show that even though a large number of open access hand-gear permits have been issued in the past not much more than 10 percent of these permits actually report landings of any amount of either cod or haddock. A preliminary assessment of qualification indicates that approximately 150 vessels would qualify for a limited access hand-gear A permit which just about as many vessels with documented landings in any given year since 1997. Thus, the conversion to a limited access permit with the potential to achieve higher landings and higher incomes overall also may permit the majority of small entities currently participating in the fishery to continue operating. The no-action alternative would yield no economic benefits as compared to the proposed action. Therefore, the proposed alternative is favorable when compared to the no-action.</p>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Increase in consumer and producer surplus; positive net benefits to wharves, stevedoring, food and fuel suppliers, etc.	Increase in consumer and producer surplus; positive net benefits to wharves, stevedoring, food and fuel suppliers, etc.

Measures	Overall Vessel Impacts	By Port of Landing	By Vessel Size	By Gear Type	By Dependence on Multispecies	Near Term Impact to the Economy	Long Term Impacts to the Economy
Elimination of Area Restriction for the Northern Shrimp Fishery	With the exception of certain fishery and habitat closed areas including the Western Gulf of Maine Habitat Closed Area, the northern shrimp fishery would have no area restrictions. All other restrictions remain in effect. The northern shrimp fishery would no longer be restricted to the area shoreward to the small mesh fishery exemption line. All other restrictions remain in effect. The elimination of the line will increase potential economic benefits for shrimp fishermen without harm to the multispecies stock. Recent studies have shown that with other devices such as the Nordmore grate, bycatch of regulated multispecies is minimal. The no-action alternative would yield no economic benefits and would not change the economic conditions in the shrimp fishery. Therefore, the proposed alternative is favorable when compared to the no-action.	Maine, New Hampshire and Massachusetts.	N/A	This would benefit trawl vessels that are currently fishing in the Northern Shrimp Fishery and potential entrants.	N/A	Increase in consumer and producer surplus; positive net benefits to wharves, stevedoring, food and fuel suppliers, etc.	Increase in consumer and producer surplus; positive net benefits to wharves, stevedoring, food and fuel suppliers, etc.
Tuna Purse Seine Vessel Access	Tuna purse seine gear is defined as exempted gear for the purposes of the multispecies FMP. Tuna purse seine vessels will be allowed into all groundfish closed areas, subject only to the normal restrictions for using an exempted gear in the area. This would benefit the purse seiners by expanding groundfish areas available for fishing and, thus, allow those vessels to increase profitability. The Council recognizes that part of the seine contains mesh less than the regulated mesh size for the multispecies fisheries.	Multiple ports from New Jersey to Maine		Purse seine gear only.		Increase in consumer and producer surplus; positive net benefits to wharves, stevedoring, food and fuel suppliers, etc.	Increase in consumer and producer surplus; positive net benefits to wharves, stevedoring, food and fuel suppliers, etc.

Measures	Overall Vessel Impacts	By Port of Landing	By Vessel Size	By Gear Type	By Dependence on Multispecies	Near Term Impact to the Economy	Long Term Impacts to the Economy
Southern New England General Category Scallop Vessel Exemption	Unless otherwise prohibited in 50 CFR 648.81, vessels with a limited access scallop permit that have declared out of the DAS program as specified in 648.10, or that have used up their DAS allocations, and vessels issued a general category scallop permit, may fish in the statistical areas 537, 538, 539, and 613 - defined as the Southern New England General Category Scallop Exemption Area - when not under a NE multispecies DAS. This would relieve a restriction and allow scallop vessels to enter expanded areas for the harvest of scallops, relieving a restriction and allowing those vessels to increase profits, if available. The no-action alternative would yield no economic benefits because vessels would be precluded from participating in this program. Therefore, the proposed alternative is favorable when compared to the no-action.	Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New York		Scallop dredges only.		Increase in consumer and producer surplus; positive net benefits to wharves, stevedoring, food and fuel suppliers, etc.	Increase in consumer and producer surplus; positive net benefits to wharves, stevedoring, food and fuel suppliers, etc.
Modified VMS	A vessel using a VMS can opt out of the fishery for a minimum period of one calendar month by notifying the Regional Administrator. Notification must include the date a vessel will resume transmitting VMS reports. After receiving confirmation from the RA, the vessel operator can stop sending VMS reports. During the period out of the VMS program, the vessel cannot engage in any fisheries until the VMS is turned back on. This would reduce operating costs associated with VMS operation, thus, increasing profitability. The no-action alternative would yield no economic benefits. Therefore, the proposed alternative is favorable when compared to the no-action.	Multiple ports where VMS Multispecies vessels are operating.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Increase in producer surplus.	Increase in producer surplus.

Measures	Overall Vessel Impacts	By Port of Landing	By Vessel Size	By Gear Type	By Dependence on Multispecies	Near Term Impact to the Economy	Long Term Impacts to the Economy
Revised Certification for Incidental Catch/Exemption Fisheries	The standards for certification of a bycatch/exempted fishery that were implemented through Amendment 7 would continue to be used. However, this measure would allow the RA to modify the 5 percent bycatch rule and make additional modifications on a one-to-one basis under an accepted set of conditions. The economic benefits or costs are uncertain with this measure since the RA could decrease the percentage used in the bycatch rule as well as increase it. However, the measure seems to be intended to allow a very controlled expansion of fishing areas, thus, benefitting vessels economically while conserving critical species. The effect of the no-action alternative would depend on the Regional Administrator's determination on a case-by-case basis, e.g., if the RA lowered the acceptable bycatch percentage, the no-action alternative would have a beneficial impact, but if the acceptable bycatch percentage was increased, the no-action would have a negative impact.	Multiple ports.	N/A	All gear types affected.	N/A	Indeterminate	Indeterminate
Period Adjustment Process	The annual adjustment process is revised to be a biennial adjustment, with the PDT performing a review and submitting management recommendations to the Council every two years. This would tend to have a positive effect on profitability of individual vessels since it would expand their planning horizon making their fishing operations more efficient and profitable. The no-action alternative would yield no economic benefits. Therefore, the proposed alternative is favorable when compared to the no-action.	Multiple ports.	N/A	All gear types affected.		Increase in producer surplus.	Increase in producer surplus.

Measures	Overall Vessel Impacts	By Port of Landing	By Vessel Size	By Gear Type	By Dependence on Multispecies	Near Term Impact to the Economy	Long Term Impacts to the Economy
US/Canada Resource Sharing Agreement	<p>Management of Georges Bank (GB) cod, haddock, and yellowtail flounder would be subject to the terms of the United States/Canada resource sharing agreement. The agreement specifies an allocation of GB cod, haddock, and yellowtail flounder for each country. The management objective is for the shared cod, haddock, and yellowtail flounder to achieve, but not exceed the US allocation fraction. This allocation would be based on a formula, which includes historical catch percentage and present resource distribution. The economic implications of this agreement would depend on the specific allocation, the reduction in DAS attributable to steaming time, and other economic considerations such as fuel prices and Canadian and US fish prices. This measure would most likely benefit larger vessels who traditionally fish GB. It would also allow each country to plan its fishing activities in advance which could result in a more efficient use of the limited resources found on GB, thus, increasing the profitability of individual vessels engaged in the fishery. The no-action alternative would yield no economic benefits as this system would not be established and fishermen would not be in a position to benefit from management measures established through this Understanding. Therefore, the proposed alternative is favorable when compared to the no-action.</p>	Multiple ports.	N/A	All gear types affected.	N/A	Increase in consumer and producer surplus; positive net benefits to wharves, stevedoring, food and fuel suppliers, etc.	Increase in consumer and producer surplus; positive net benefits to wharves, stevedoring, food and fuel suppliers, etc.

Measures	Overall Vessel Impacts	By Port of Landing	By Vessel Size	By Gear Type	By Dependence on Multispecies	Near Term Impact to the Economy	Long Term Impacts to the Economy
Sector Allocation	<p>Under this measure, sector allocation may be used to apportion part or all of groundfish fishery resources to various industry sectors. A self-selected group of permit holders may agree to form a sector and submit a binding plan for management of that sector's allocation of catch or effort. Allocations to each sector may be based on catch (hard TACs) or effort (DAS) with target TACs specified for each sector. Vessels within the sector would be allowed to pool harvesting resources and consolidate operations in fewer vessels if they desired. One of the major benefits of self selecting sectors is that they provide incentives to self-govern, therefore, reducing the need for Council-mandated measures. A primary motivation for the formation of a sector is assurance that members of the sector would not face reductions of catch or effort as a result of the actions of vessels outside the sector (i.e., if the other vessels exceed their target TACs). This measure could benefit vessels within a sector since they would be able to better plan and control their fishing operations. However, as sector plans evolve, each plan would need to include an economic analysis to determine the extent, if any, that vessels outside the sector are negatively impacted. By creating a process for the formation of self-selecting sectors, this Amendment creates an opportunity for groups of vessels to adapt their fishing behavior so that they remain economically viable in the face of increasing restrictions imposed to rebuild groundfish stocks. The ability to form a sector could be an important component of providing flexibility to small commercial fishing entities to mitigate the economic impacts of the Amendment. Further, depending on the geographic location of the membership of a given sector, sector allocation could also provide an opportunity for fishing communities to reduce economic impacts. The no-action alternative would yield no economic benefits. Therefore, the proposed alternative is favorable when compared to the no-action.</p>	Multiple ports.	N/A	All gear types affected.	N/A	Increase in consumer and producer surplus; positive net benefits to wharves, stevedoring, food and fuel suppliers,etc.	Increase in consumer and producer surplus; positive net benefits to wharves, stevedoring, food and fuel suppliers,etc.

Measures	Overall Vessel Impacts	By Port of Landing	By Vessel Size	By Gear Type	By Dependence on Multispecies	Near Term Impact to the Economy	Long Term Impacts to the Economy
GB Hook Sector	<p>The proposed action would create a voluntary sector for longline/hook vessels on GB. This provides an opportunity for vessels to mitigate the impacts of the management alternatives. By organizing into a cooperative, vessels may be able to develop more efficient ways to harvest groundfish and minimize the inefficiencies that result from the regulations. While it is not possible to estimate the economic impacts of a sector until the actual participants are known, the pool of participants will probably be the vessels that have used longline gear to fish on GB in the past. For fishing years 1996 through 2000, 182 vessels reported using longline gear to catch GB cod. This alternative also includes access to CAI to harvest haddock. From 1996 through 2000, 44 hook vessels reported landing GB haddock, roughly one-fourth of the total number that reported landing GB cod.</p> <p>Allowing access to CAI for vessels that choose to participate in the sector may increase the ability of these vessels to target GB haddock, further mitigating the impacts of the rebuilding programs.</p>	Massachusetts most affected. Specifically the ports of Chatham and Harwich.	N/A	Longline vessels only.	N/A	Increase in consumer and producer surplus; positive net benefits to wharves, stevedoring, food and fuel suppliers, etc.	Increase in consumer and producer surplus; positive net benefits to wharves, stevedoring, food and fuel suppliers, etc.

Compliance Costs for the Proposed Measures	<p>All groundfish DAS vessels participating in the U.S./Canada Understanding, and all participants in SAPs, with the exception of the SNE/MA Winter Flounder SAP, must use VMS within these programs. Any vessel that does not currently possess a VMS must obtain one prior to fishing in a SAP or in the U.S./Canada Management Area. The cost of purchasing and installing VMS, along with the associated operational costs is currently estimated at \$3,600 per vessel.</p> <p>The required changes to mesh size² were estimated to affect 424 trawl vessels fishing in the GOM or GB area, and 221 trawl vessels fishing in the SNE area. The average cost to replace a codend was estimated to be \$1,250. The mesh changes were estimated to affect 18 Day gillnet vessels that use tie-down nets in the GOM. The average cost to these vessels to replace their nets is estimated to be \$7,794. The mesh changes were estimated to affect 31 Day gillnet vessels that use stand-up nets in the GOM. The average cost to these vessels to replace their nets was \$9,300. The mesh changes were estimated to affect 25 Trip gillnet vessels that fish in the GOM. The average cost to these vessels to replace their nets was estimated to be \$18,352. The mesh changes were estimated to affect 32 gillnet vessels that fished in either GB or SNE. The average cost to these vessels to replace their nets was estimated to be \$8,800. Finally, the requirement for groundfish vessels to fish with a haddock separator trawl or a flatfish net when fishing in the U.S./Canada Resource Sharing Understanding areas was estimated to affect 400 vessels. The average cost for these vessels to replace their nets with a flatfish net was estimated to be \$7500, and the average cost associated with purchasing and installing a separator panel, for the purposes of being in compliance with the haddock separator trawl net requirement, was estimated to be approximately \$747.</p>	Maine, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts most impacted	N/A	All trawl and gillnets vessels fishing in the GOM and SNE		Decrease in producer surplus.	Increase in consumer and producer surplus; positive net benefits to wharves, stevedoring, food and fuel suppliers, etc.
--	---	---	-----	---	--	-------------------------------	---

Record Keeping and Reporting Requirements

The proposed measures under Amendment 13 include the following provisions requiring either new or revised reporting and record keeping requirements: (1) Initial vessel application for a limited access Handgear A permit; (2) limited access Handgear A permit appeals; (3) DAS baseline appeals; (4) DAS Transfer Program application; (5) VMS purchase and installation; (6) automated VMS polling of vessel position twice per hour while fishing within the U.S./Canada Area; (7) VMS proof of installation; (8) SAP area and DAS use declaration via VMS prior to each trip into a SAP; (9) notice requirements for observer deployment prior to every trip into the CA I Hook Gear SAP; (10) expedited submission of a proposed SAP; (11) request to power down VMS for at least 1 month; (12) GB Hook Gear Cod Trip Limit Exemption declaration; (13) request for an LOA to participate in the GOM Cod Landing Exemption; (14) request for an LOA to participate in the Yellowtail Flounder Possession/Landing Exemption for the Northern Yellowtail Trip Limit Area; (15) request for an LOA to participate in the Yellowtail Flounder Possession/Landing Exemption in SNE and MA RMAs; (16) request for an LOA to participate in the Monkfish Southern Fishery Management Area Landing Limit and Minimum Fish Size Exemption; (17) request for an LOA to participate in the Skate Bait-only Possession Limit Exemption; (18) submission of a sector allocation proposal; (19) submission of a plan of operations for an approved sector allocation; (20) daily electronic catch and discard reports of GB cod, GB haddock, and GB yellowtail flounder when fishing within the U.S./Canada Area and/or the associated SAPs; and (21) annual reporting requirement for sectors. The compliance costs associated with most of these new reporting and record keeping requirements are minimal, consisting only of postage and copying costs.